



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY

Entered as second-class matter November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 1 1879

VOL. V

NEW YORK, MARCH 30, 1912

No. 21

I have frequently been accused of a tendency to pessimism in these editorials. Those teachers who get through the week with a modicum of sunshine 'eft find this suddenly obliterated by the Stygian darkness of this page. I wonder if they are right and if it really is pessimism to see a danger near at hand, or even afar off, and urge preparation against it. Only a week ago I was informed that a distinguished educator had said to his audience that it is only a matter of months at the most before we shall get rid of this ancient rubbish of the Classics and Algebra and the like; "then we shall really begin to educate". This man is not merely an isolated case. He is a type which is unfortunately present in large numbers among the educational administrators of the country, if it does not form the majority. Now, which is better: to take account of such statements and try to offset them, either by convincing the multitude of the value of our work as at present carried on, or by improving its quality so that it is beyond criticism, or to bask in the sunshine of our week's experience until it is too late to do anything? But my critics say, 'We are successful, we are doing good work; why trouble us?' Is this statement true? Are we successful? Certainly we are not by the standard of the College Entrance Board examinations, and we are not in the judgment of many thinkers. In the School Review for February the Commissioner of Education for Massachusetts in an article on The Opportunity of the Small High School deprecates the teaching of more than one foreign language in the small High School, because, as he says:

Seldom have such schools the means of teaching one at all adequately; but it is unbelievable that so many of them should palm off on the public so-called Latin, French, and German teaching which is not even a fair imitation of language teaching according to any adequate standard. Let the small high school never attempt more than one foreign language; let it teach that intensively through four years; let it permit no pupil to continue in the subject who has not real capacity for it; and incidentally, let the school obtain as a teacher of this subject one who knows something about it—if a modern language, one who can understand and use it. Americans are hospitable to shams, and yield to self-delusion in education as in other matters; but in no other respect are we so much imposed upon as in the high-school teaching of foreign language.

I am credibly informed that—as I have often emphasized, even to the verge of pessimism—the chief obstacle in the State of New York to the success

of the new syllabus in Latin is the inability of Latin teachers to teach translation at sight. Does this confirm the attitude of the Commissioner of Education of Massachusetts or does it refute it? On the other hand, I am just as credibly informed that all the teachers in the state are anxious for any suggestions that may lead to the betterment of their methods. This seems to me a very encouraging fact. The Commissioner of Massachusetts insists that the weakness in the teaching of foreign languages lies especially in the small high school in the small towns in the state. Is this true? In the City of New York do we make such a success of the teaching of Latin to our High School pupils that the great majority of every class is really prepared for promotion at the end of the term? These questions have to be answered because persons not our friends are answering them in a way that we do not like.

Meanwhile, one of the most enlightened criticisms upon college instruction was made by Professor Oldfather of the University of Illinois in an article in the Educational Review for November last, on Common Sense and the Elective System. The gist of the article is given in the concluding words:

To conclude, one might draw up a table of those subjects which (1) must be studied in college, if ever, e. g., the science (including psychology), mathematics, the ancient languages, and the early periods of the modern languages; (2) those which ought to be studied in college at least so far as the point of view is concerned, but pursued further after graduation, e. g., philosophy and logic, history, economics, political science, English literature, and the modern languages as literary criticism; (3) those which may be taken in college, but can with profit be both begun and continued after graduation, e. g., English literature and the modern languages as mere reading and for practical purposes, art, music, household science, etc.

It has always seemed very strange to me that thinking men could actually defend the wide extension of college courses in those fields which, if the student were properly trained, should afford the relaxation and the joy of his postcollegiate life. I refer to the courses in English literature, in modern foreign literatures, in history and similar things, i. e. those mentioned in the second part of Professor Oldfather's summary. Historical method and the canons of historical criticism should be taught in college, but when these are once learned there is no necessity for heaping up courses in history. The

fundamentals of literary criticism, whether of English or of modern foreign languages, should be taught in college and as far as possible the taste and the habit of reading good literature should be developed, but I can see no reason for devoting the college course to extensive reading of English literature. The study of Latin and Greek literature in college is eminently desirable for the reason that there is but little opportunity for pursuing it in later life. Under our present method of instruction in these languages this is even more vitally essential because our students never get the ability to read with sufficient fluency to make the subtle enjoyment of Greek or Latin literature an easy matter.

It would be too much to hope that the interested classes will consent to a modification of the college curriculum along the lines suggested in Professor Oldfather's essay, for vested interests are always a serious obstacle in the path of reform. But to my mind the division of the subjects suggested is thoroughly sound and should be recognized in any properly organized college.

G. L.

A Latin Grammar. By Harry Edwin Burton. Boston: Silver, Burdett and Company (1911). Pp. xii + 337. \$0.90.

(Concluded from page 156.)

In the part of the book dealing with Syntax there are many sections whose wording, though not in all cases original, impresses the reviewer favorably for clearness and freshness of expression: notable examples are §§ 405, 411, 451, 502-504, 510, 528, 549, 650, 680, 698, 699, 709, 743, 756, 795, 798, 821, 907 ff. (on conditions), 938. Yet sometimes statements are made in too difficult a way for the learner readily to grasp their purport, as in 789, 863, 886. Many sections fail to be clear, as 431 (the statement about ellipsis of *crimine* needs amplification); 464 (the last statement gives the impression that the preposition itself governs the dative); 481 ("to avoid ambiguity" is itself not clear); 499; 523; 545; 593; 700; 734³ (inadequate, for the reflexive is sometimes accusative and sometimes dative in idea); 763; 764¹; 827 (the second statement); 845; 890; 894; 898 (the difference between adversative and concessive is not adequately explained). Cross-references are sometimes needed, as to § 735 in § 388, to §§ 998-999 in § 990. Other sections need examples for illustration, as 381 (examples of appositives not agreeing in number, or not in gender, or not in either); 426; 432; 440; 444²; 458; 554 (an example of ablative of manner with *cum* and adjective is desirable); 582 (an example of *quōd . . . eō*); 622; 727; 793 (an example of the primary sequence; also one of a subjunctive depending upon a present infinitive or present participle that depends upon a secondary tense). A desire to limit the size of the book is not a sufficient reason for the absence of examples in these sections.

But above all, the translation of the examples should make clear the peculiarities of syntax illustrated, and not be merely proof of the author's mastery of English, if they are to help the student in the preparatory school. While Professor Burton does not sin in this respect to the extent of Lane-Morgan—whose grammar, moreover, could hardly be used except by advanced students, though to such it is indispensable—there are many examples that are hardly translated in the (pedagogically) best way. Thus in § 346 *ventum est* is rendered by 'some one came' but it means also, and more often, 'they (he, we) came'. In § 356 *peccāre licet nēmini* is translated by 'no one is at liberty to sin', which does not bring out the point, that *peccāre* is the subject of *licet*. In § 628, *scūta latentia condunt*, to illustrate the prolepsis, must be translated 'they put their shields away so that they are concealed', not 'they put their shields away in concealment'. In § 556 the translation of *cum* in Cat. 1. 33 is misleading or wrong: the passage means 'attended by your own ruin and destruction'; translation by *to* makes the phrase express tendency (§ 483). In § 668 the last example is wrongly explained, for the words quoted are all spoken by Catiline, to whom, as subject of the verb of saying earlier in the passage, the *sibi* refers. How *idem* (§ 726) means 'moreover' or 'yet' is not clear, unless it be translated 'likewise', 'yet likewise'. The last example of § 749 means rather 'now at last (= after this respite) exact the penalty'. In § 916 the translation is ambiguous, as 'strike fearless' may be understood as 'make fearless'. In § 946 both examples need literal and free translations, as the idiom is both difficult and important, and the free translation of the second should be 'from this the regard of all Gaul would be turned away from him'. In § 962 the translation of the last example makes the infinitive a direct object, and not an infinitive of purpose. Similar defects are found in the translations in §§ 438, ex. 1; 696, ex. 2; 792, last ex.; 800, ex. 1; 827, ex. 1; 995, ex. 2.

Further, some examples are not typical, or are not certainly illustrative of the rule. Thus in § 368 the question quoted is only part of a twofold question, neither part of which should be quoted alone, 'Did Scipio kill Gracchus, and yet shall we bear with Catiline?'; in this the first part of the question is a logical protasis to the second. In example 1 of § 385, *principium* may be nominative just as well as accusative. In § 390, example 2 needs a note pointing out that *vōs* is accusative; otherwise the student may think it nominative, and expect *probi*, by § 951. In § 497, three kinds of accusatives are confused under one heading. In examples 2 and 3 of § 627, the predicate adjectives do not modify the nouns through the medium of a verb, as is called for by the rule; the error is in the rule. The last example in § 628 is not one of the proleptic use of an adjective, but is exactly like example 3 of § 627. The idiom of the